

*Please read and then hand to another or into a Reading Room*

# PARLIAMENTARY CORRUPTION

AS DEVELOPED IN ITS CONNECTION WITH

## JESUIT † INCORPORATION

— AND —

## THE : QUEBEC : JESUIT : ESTATES : ACT !

— THEREBY —

Placing Protestantism at a Discount,

AND AIDING AND ABETTING

• Romish Aggression in Canada;

Including observations relative to Mr. Laurier as the  
proposed Dominion Liberal Leader.

Written in a Plain and Impartial, but Fearlessly Un-  
sparing and Popular Style,

BY A BRITISH CANADIAN.

**PRICE, 10 CENTS.**

FOR SALE BY

Toronto Willard Tract Depository, corner Yonge and Temperance Streets,  
TORONTO, ONTARIO.

## FAVORABLE NOTICES OF "ORIGINAL REPLY TO PAINE'S AGE OF REASON."

In introducing to the reader the following very favorable notices of our reply to "Paine's Age of Reason," we would acknowledge, with thanks, very interesting communications received from the Bishops of *Niagara* and of *Algoma*, bearing testimony to the logical character of the work, and the earnest spirit of the author; also the kindly wish expressed by his Lordship, the *Bishop of Huron* "that God may bless this effort in the cause of truth." Also the following FROM THE RIGHT REV., the *Bishop of Montreal*. His Lordship, in acknowledging the receipt the book writes. "I have examined your book 'A New and Original reply to Paine's Age of Reason' with some care, and the result has been the conviction that it is calculated to be of much use—especially to many of the present day who assume that 'Paine' and such writers have on their side more truth than theologians like to admit. It is sometimes objected that in this way we create doubts in many minds. I do not think so. The doubts exist through the efforts of sceptical writers—which has resulted in a widely circulated sceptical literature—and we ought to supply the remedy. I think you have done well."

FROM THE REV. MARK TURNBULL, *Church of England Clergyman, Listowel*: "I have carefully read Mr. Stephens' reply to Paine's Age of Reason' and have been much impressed by the manner in which he presents his arguments. The work is excellent and cannot but prove of great assistance to students of the Bible and its evidences—the most important of which are herein ably presented in support of the Word of God, and can only have been reached and brought together by a most careful course of reading and investigation. The book is rich in facts and arguments—the form is good and likely to attract attention—while the tone of the writer is characterized by courtesy and firmness, I shall be glad to hear of its attaining a wide circulation, particularly among the young."

FROM THE HON. SENATOR GOWAN, *Late Local Judge of the High Court of Justice for Ontario, and Senior Judge of the Judicial District of Simcoe*. This learned and, by all classes, much esteemed Judge in his critical notice of the book says: "A work like Mr. Stephens' 'Original Reply' to Paine's Age of Reason deserves a more careful and accurate study than the limited time at my disposal has allowed me to give it. It will be obvious to any one reading it that it is an eminently practical and common sense way of dealing with a book which, while doing an immense deal of harm (more than most people are aware of) has, so far as I know, never been met with the exact antidote for such a poison. Meeting Paine's assertions in a way that shows them to be anything but arguments, Mr. Stephens advances step by step, not only demolishing the assertions, but also removing the debris, lest perchance some inexperienced builder should attempt to construct a new edifice out of them—and doing this in such a simple and practical way that one can see at a glance that there is nothing of special pleading about it. I feel sure that no one can rise from a careful unprejudiced study of this little work without feeling that any doubts or shadows which a perusal of Paine's works called up have been effectually scattered and dissipated—as error always will be when confronted with the light of truth.\*

\*"Favorable Notices" continued at the end of this book.

# PARLIAMENTARY CORRUPTION

—AS DEVELOPED IN ITS CONNECTION WITH—

## JESUIT INCORPORATION

—AND—

## THE : QUEBEC : JESUITS : ESTATES : ACT !

—THEREBY—

Placing Protestantism at a Discount,

AND AIDING AND ABETTING

ROMISH AGGRESSION IN CANADA.



Written in a Plain and Impartial, but Fearlessly Un-  
sparing and Popular Style,

BY A BRITISH CANADIAN.



FOR SALE BY

Toronto Willard Tract Depository, corner Yonge and Temperance Streets,  
TORONTO, ONTARIO.

JESUIT INCORPORATION,  
—AND—  
THE QUEBEC JESUIT ESTATES ACT.

Pope Pious 9, in his well known "Syllabus," as shown by Mr. Gladstone, has "condemned and anathematized, with fearfully energetic epithets, *liberty of conscience or worship, liberty of speech, and the liberty of the press*, and condemns as one of the monstrous errors of the day, that in countries called Catholic, the free exercise of other religions may be laudably allowed," and very bold indeed have his servants, the Jesuits, already become, when they would even attempt to gag the Protestant press in a Protestant Country—witness their vengeful combination against the proprietors of the *Toronto Mail*; a transaction by the way, they can well afford to sustain, when the Dominion, of which Quebec forms a part, pays their lawyers and foots their bills, by appropriating to their very benevolent, patriotic, and loyal use, the nice round sum of \$400,000. It is true that Pope Leo 13, as Governor General and Chancellor of Canada's exchequer, did not feel disposed to entrust them with the whole of it; yet brother Jesuits understand well what that means, and that they will not in the future, on that account, lack anything needful, as the Pope's most zealous and faithful sons. Our Rev. Chancellor, the Pope, has other institutions in Canada to sustain, and His Holiness' authority in connection with each must of course be duly recognized and acknowledged. When, however, a British Cardinal avers that "the Roman Catholic Church never will acknowledge any limit to her jurisdiction," as was the case but a very short time ago in London, it is time, I think, for British statesman to awake to the necessity of an effectual humbling of her proud pretensions by setting such a limit to her jurisdiction as shall cause the civil autocracy and spiritual harlotry of the old "mother of abominations" to henceforth and forever cease upon British soil, and throughout the entire extent of the British dominions. And if they do their duty as enlightened, consistent Protestant representatives, they will, as soon as possible, do it.

This Papal Hierarchy, called a "charch," however, we find is not only *tolerated* in Canada, it is patronized! A few years ago the Government of this country, which has recently endowed Romanism and the Jesuits, refused to incorporate the Orangemen as a body of Protestants in a Protestant Country! and now, forsooth, in this same Protestant Country, they consent to the incorporation and endowment of the Jesuits as a steadily increasing and persistently encroaching anti-Protestant body of Roman Catholics! One would think that they were, upon each occasion, in session at a particular phase of the moon, and were, in consequence, laboring under at least temporary insanity! Denying this, however, it certainly lays them, one and all, open to a very serious impeachment of their motives.

But the idea of Protestants in a Protestant country, as in Canada, asking, aye, *begging* of a Protestant Government "equal rights," with Romanists, that the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches be placed upon an "equal" footing, impresses one as a something that is really ludicrous! and to think that, through the power of pelf and the love of position, even this is denied them!! I observe through



the public journals, that the Governor General, as well as the Government, is being petitioned on the subject ; and if he is himself governed by Christian principle, it will be of some avail ; but if like some others, our Governor General is a weakling about whom there is no positive, Protestant self assertion, appeals made to him, as to Sir John, will be in vain.\*

I am certainly much pleased, highly gratified to observe, through the public journals, the general, the enthusiastic interest, I may say, that is at present everywhere being manifested in Ontario and other parts of the Dominion, on this vitally important subject. But with those who say, "We have no quarrel with the Roman Catholic Church as such," I cannot agree, but must take a very decided step in advance of them in connection with this movement ; and for this simple, and, I think, all sufficient reason, that it is Romanism and the Roman Catholic Church, as such, that is at the root of all the trouble complained of, and that the Pope and his "Church" are hence collectively and always responsible for it, since Jesuitism is the recognized, legitimate offspring of Romanism, and simply embodies its principles and discovers and unfolds its character. We have, then, a quarrel with Rome and Romanism, as well as with the Jesuits and Jesuitism. Why the Jesuits themselves, all over the county, sly, cunning creatures that they are, must be laughing in their sleeves at the folly of those who are endeavoring to disassociate Jesuitism from Romanism, and to persuade themselves that there is a difference between them. The teachings of the Jesuits are not peculiar to Jesuitism, they are peculiar to Romanism ; and the Jesuits have pledged themselves by solemn oath to zealously carry out those Romish tenets, that is all. Their principles of action existed as doctrinal and disciplinary tenets of that Church before Jesuitism, in name, and Loyola, its founder, had an existence.

At the Anti-Jesuit Convention, held in Toronto, (June 12, 1889,) Rev. D. Cavan said, "Though he did not accept the Romish system, he recognized the fact that it was just as much entitled to existence in Canada as the Presbyterian system." Here, however, as in duty bound, I take issue with the learned Doctor, as also with those who with perhaps a latent fear of offending Roman Catholics in general, side with him in his expressed views touching this particular point. Romanism has *no* rights in Canada, or upon any British, or Protestant territory. It has by its iniquitous, cruel, and bloody deeds against Protestants of the past ; by its unannulled canons and published atrocious principles and aims of the present ; by the the well-known Syllabus of Pope Pious 9, which embodies all those atrocious principles ; by the still more recent Jesuitical Encyclicals of Pope Leo 13 ; and by its ceaseless, undying, inextinguishable aim at universal sovereignty, temporal and spiritual, and the extirpation of all opposing supremacies, civil as well as religious—it has, I say, by such papistically approved principles, aims, and doings forfeited all claim to be recognized as having any rights whatever in any Protestant country,

\*The above was written before the influential "Equal Rights" deputation, bearing a petition signed by 60,000 voters, representing a portion of Ontario, waited on and received the reply of the Governor General at Quebec, refusing disallowance ; and this, it is said, at the dictation of the Pope's representative, Sir John Thompson, and the rest of his anti-Protestant advisers.

And this position, which we here need do no more than thus concisely state, brings prominently to our view the very considerate *kindness* shown to Rome by our Canadian Government (having Sir John Macdonald at its head) in presenting to that very amiable body of Romanists, the *Jesuits*, through the Quebec Legislature, the nice little encouraging sum of \$400,000 to be retained by them in full or in part, at the discretion of the Pope, and which must be most gratifying and inspiring to them, no doubt, in their Anti-Protestant "work of faith and labor of love!" We think, however, that the money was very unwisely appropriated, and could scarcely have been devoted to a worse or more censurable purpose. A year or more before, (in 1887,) as all Canadians know, these Roman Jesuits had been incorporated, and by the sanction of the same Protestant (!) Dominion Government; and this, too, in face of the fact that only a few years before the Orange Society, which is a Society organized as a protective Protestant body, were refused incorporation!

Such a procedure on the part of a Government which is, in name, very largely Protestant, is simply astounding! And its head, knowing well his ill desert, will perhaps pardon me when I say—You ought to be horsewhipped, Sir John, and your Cabinet should be made to swing the whip; and if they didn't lay it on heavy enough, they should have it themselves—in fact, you all most richly deserve it, but more especially the ringleader of the Protestant Anti-Protestant Parliamentary Combination, who plays the chameleon so adroitly, and who rides the many-hued beast, as captain, in true military style, as oft as changing circumstances and occasions may require!

There has, however, I am pleased to observe, been a very general feeling expressed throughout the country for a disallowance, by the Dominion Government, of the obnoxious Act, although it has not been as yet (July, 1889,) disallowed. Referring to said disallowance, which from Christian Protestant considerations, even if from no other, would certainly be most desirable as well as most just in a Protestant country, a Canadian political journal (the organ of Sir John Macdonald, the Premier,) says, we are striving to "rouse the devil of sectarian feeling." This must have come either from the pen of a Jesuit, or from a Jesuitically interested Tory. Jesuit Tory or Jesuit Grit, however, it doesn't matter a whit; but to this gentleman scribbler whoever he may be, we will, as it is a question of importance bearing upon the general subject of this work, take occasion to reply, that raising a general *Protestant* "feeling," on behalf of the general and most vital interests of a Protestant nation or Federation, is *not* raising a "*sectarian* feeling." To attempt to "rouse the feelings," for example, of a Presbyterian body, or of a Methodist, a Baptist, an Episcopalian, or of any other sectarian body for the promotion of an isolated and exclusively Sectarian object, would be "to strive to raise a sectarian feeling;" but the *Protestantism* of a Protestant country, including and combining all protestant divisions, orders, and sects, political and religious, for the general weal of the entire country, is not sectarianism; it is the country's Protestant nationalism; and such a

"feeling" with its object, should be sustained by its General Government.

Mr. Laurier, however, speaking of the supremacy of "the Provinces in their sphere," said before the House: "The judgment of the Provinces should not be superseded by the judgment of another power," Is it no part, then, of the function of the higher or General Government, to oversee, and, when necessary, overrule and nullify the Acts of the Local Governments, in the interests of the Provinces as a whole, and according to its own supreme and authoritative judgment? Mr. Laurier's statement were one and the same as to say, that because, e. g., the different members of a family have certain powers, and are allowed by the parent and head of the family to exercise them, in many respects, more or less independently, therefore the parent should not oversee or exercise any authoritative control over any of their particular actions and doings! The idea is simply absurd. If "their judgment" in any matter is not to be "superseded by another and a higher power," to which it is constitutionally related, then to it there is no higher power—no power superior to its own, which as to all nationalities and forms of Government, graduated as they are from the municipal upwards, is also absurd. And with this, Sir John A. McDonald appears to clearly agree; for he said upon the same occasion in Parliament: "All bills should be subject to disallowance, if they affect general interests. Sir, we are not half-a-dozen Provinces. We are one great Dominion. If we commit an offence against the laws of property, or any other atrocity in legislation, it will be widely known." And this sentiment of Sir John's is exactly what we wish to see consistently carried out.

Again, in speaking upon the same subject, the Hon. E. Blake, M. A., concedes the principle, that "where the law and the *general interests of the Dominion*, imperatively demand it, then and then only should the power of disallowance be exercised." That is reasonable. And if there is any one "subject" that "imperatively demands" Dominion Governmental interference, it is, I think, that which has agitated the public mind in connection with this Jesuitical Provincial law. It is a subject which should not be left to the exclusive control of any merely local Legislature, inasmuch as it affects the entire interests, material, social, civil, and religious, for weal or for woe, of the federated communities, which as a united whole, constitute the Dominion.

The Act, although passed by a local legislature, and which is hence *nominally* a local Act is really a national one, affecting the civil and material, as well as the moral and religious interests and convictions of the people as a Protestant Confederation and Dominion; and this, too, vastly more prospectively, and in the more or less remote future, than immediately. A precedent of this nature, in favor of a Romish, Jesuitical priesthood, of all others is exceedingly dangerous; and, being in the truest and broadest sense of the word impolitic, it should be vetoed or repealed by the Dominion Government.

All Provincial Governments, with the people of the Provinces, it will doubtless be conceded, should have the right of appeal, on all subjects, to the Dominion Government; and, as the supreme authority it should in every case decide as to whether a matter submitted



to it against the doings of any individual Province, be detrimental to the general interests of the Dominion as a whole or not. And this principle and right of general governmental supervision and veto has, upon different occasions and upon comparatively unimportant matters, been practically recognized by the present head of the Government, notwithstanding the amount of subterfuge and quibbling there has been manifested against the exercise of the right in connection with the matter before us.

But what unpatriotic and unstatesmanlike maneuvering have we observed, on both sides of the House, for "Catholic" patronage and votes, in connection with this question of gravest importance to the Country! Reformers and Conservatives alike refusing to veto a Jesuitically enacted unrighteous Act; and which veto they cannot but admit would be for the general good of the Country, although it might not be immediately promotive of their individual political and pecuniary interests. Bah! Such Reformers! Such Conservatives! They will each sell their country in its holiest and highest interests for a morsel of bread—their Lord, and everything he has at stake, for a mess of pottage!! The Conservatives, shaking in their shoes, will not veto, because the serfs of Pope Leo stand with uplifted lash ready to scourge them if they do; and because, forsooth, Reformers (so called) are, according to the *Globe*, waiting the opportunity to take advantage of it and also pounce upon them if they do! It is thus six with one and half-a-dozen with the other of them—two sets of postillions riding the devil's horses in turn, with himself in the carriage manipulating the whip and lines as head driver. Now do not say, respected Grits, that it is the "Catholic" Reformers (Retrograders!) who would constrain you to take advantage of the Conservative veto and rush you with them to the poles for re-election, because the *grit* will be grinding under your teeth while you say it—you know better; you know, as I gather from the *Globe's* representations that you would one and all be only too glad to do it. And the Act, the *Veto* act, however righteous, might "go to the devil," or anywhere else, for ought you would care after getting into power; as the "Jesuits' Estates Act," with the Jesuits themselves, and the whole creation with them, may, for ought the Conservatives now in power care, provided they be compensated for the dire calamity by the retention of power. In Parliament the opposite sides of the House may usually be compared (not to be disrespectful) to two representative dogs, elected to perform in a ring, with noses extended, growling and showing their teeth to each other; and each alike jealous and afraid of the successful spring and grip of the other! Or like two well known animals of the feline species, representing Wig and Tory, with backs set, tails whirling, fur rising, and spitting in each others face until the supreme moment arrives for one or the other to be the death of his rival! While the Roman Catholic members, Conservative and Reform, are, at the same time, either taking part in the fray, or, in the character of the Pope's *Vigilance Committee*, are jealously looking on, and ready to snap at the first feline party that shakes a paw or moves their tail at them! And for this sort of cat pawing and spitting we have to pay the gentlemen rivals, one and all, handsomely for the exhibition! while our country is being handed over by them to the temporal power and juris-



diction of the Pope, and our people to the tender mercies of the Jesuits of Christian rack and thumbscrew notoriety!

Well, I suppose we shall have to bear it, under existing circumstances and the present *regime*, as well as we can; but we, all we who are sincerely desirous of the reign of righteousness and of the King of Kings on the earth, may nevertheless fervently desire and pray, that the beginning of the time may soon be permitted to dawn upon us, when Satan with his present Conservative Liberals and Grit Reformers, shall be shut up together for the predicted period of "a thousand years;" and I can only hope that I may not live to see them let out again!

Jesuitism and Romanism are one. What then, so far as it can be expressed in a sentence or two, is this Romanism that these Canadian politicians are so free to patronize even in its worst and most unpopular Order? Mix Judaism, Heathenism, and Christianity together, and what will the compound be? Neither one nor the other, will it? Such is Romanism; an unauthorized compound quacked and made up of clippings from the three, it is neither one nor the other; and while it is composed largely of the objectionable features of the two former, it possesses none of the true Christian charity and Catholic spirit of the latter. Its covetous and greedy, as well as autocratic ambition and wordly aim, is to subjugate the world and cause it to lie in civil and religious homage at its feet. The hierarchy, however, as the late illustrious Duke of Wellington, in his argument against Catholic emancipation, said, "has too much power already and will only use more to obtain more." And so most truly said the late Archbishop of Canterbury: "It is the known Characteristic of the Roman Catholic religion not only to be aggressive, but encroaching; and to rest satisfied with nothing short of absolute domination." And the late Lord Palmerston, referring to the sect or division of the Romish hierarchy denominated the "Order of Jesuits," when called upon to vindicate, the advice which he gave in reference to the suppression of a rising civil war in Switzerland, and which was stirred up by the artifices of the Jesuits, said: "*I stated that it was my belief that the presence of the Jesuits in any Country, Catholic or Protestant, was likely to disturb the political and social peace of that Country.*" And in order to prevent the effusion of blood in Switzerland, "England proposed that the Jesuits, as the object and cause of the war, should be withdrawn"; and yet at the present time she harbors and suffers them to exist within her own Dominions!! Good advice is often more readily given than taken.

It adds very much to the importance of our position as directed against the encroachments made by Rome, through her wily agents the Jesuits, in Canada, that they are, and have been for years past, at work in the same way in England. Listen to what Dr. Wyle, of England, says, as published in a monthly paper of the *Protestant Alliance*: "Step by step Rome has pushed on her aggressions; she has got a million from the national exchequer one year, and a million another; she has made our national organization a channel for her own action; she has planted a little Rome in the bosom of our parliament, she has set up a second Peter's chair at Westminster; she has her Legate-a-latere in Ireland, who decides causes in the Pope's name; she is blotting out

the laws of our making, and writing in our statute-books the edicts of the canon law ; she plants chaplains in our army and in our navy, in our gaols and in our poor-houses. She sets down a Convent here, a Monastery there—Popish prisons, of which the priest carries the key and administers the Government, overrides the authority of British law and the protection of British justice. Steadily, persistently, she is changing our laws, religion, and morals. Papists commit a third of our crime, but they form only a twelfth part of our population. What will our morals and taxes be when Papists shall form a third of our population ?”

But to refer again to the inseparable connection between Jesuitism and Romanism, we would further observe, that neither Dr. Cavan, of the Presbyterian College, who seems to think it possible, nor any other man, not excepting Pope Leo himself, can draw a line of distinction between Jesuitism, pure and simple, and Roman Catholicism. Jesuitism and Roman Catholicism are, by mutual consent, wedded, and are as much one as is husband and wife, although they may each indulge in an occasional quarrel. Nor may the former be more lawfully divorced than the latter, nor half so easily. It is a permanent institution, incorporated not only by the disinterested good will of Sir John, of “no disallowance” notoriety, but by the Popes themselves, into the very constitution of Catholic canon and creed, as an essential principle of Romish action and aggression. And hence when an infallible Pope dies, he hands over his infallibly adopted spouse to Pope Successor, binding him to tenderly care for her as long as his natural life shall last ; to be thenceforth again transferred and perpetuated as an act of infallibility “which changeth not.” In principle and in practice they are one ; and hence to incorporate Jesuitism is to incorporate Romanism, and *vice versa*. It is true that, in 1773, the Jesuit Order was nominally suppressed by Pope Clement 14, at the special request of the Catholic State Governments of Europe ; but he thereby impeached his predecessors’ “infallibility” ; lost his own ; heaped obloquy upon the canon principles of the hierarchy ; virtually and unpoped himself ; and having been assassinated almost immediately after their suppression, he is believed to have fallen a victim to the vengeful ire of the Jesuits!

Their moral, inquisitorial, and doctrinal tenets and principles, including their claims to civil as well as ecclesiastical jurisdiction, were, as we have intimated, in the “church” and actively operating long before Jesuitism as such was in existence. But even were it not so, it has like all its other obnoxious, anti-christian innovations, been made, by “infallible” decree, part and parcel of the church ; and Jesuitism is therefore as legitimately and as much a constituent and constitutional part of the Church of Rome as the Popedom is.

Jesuitism originated with Loyola in 1540 ; and as to the prior existence of the atrocious, Anti-christian, Jesuitical principles relative to persecuting and killing “heretics,” false swearing, aims at civil and universal jurisdiction, giving rise, when circumstances are favorable, to dissention, anarchy, and the disruption of State ties and the relation between sovereign and subjects, etc., we have only to refer the reader for confirmation to the records of history, and to their canon law. “But what is their canon law ?” it may be asked. We reply : In its authority, it is to Papal Rome what the Code Napoleon was to France,

and what the Code Victoria is, or ought to be, to all her Majesty's dominions. It is an integral part of Romanism, which is therefore justly chargeable with all the errors which it enacts. "It is," says the Rev. R. B. T. Kidd, M. A., "a collection of conciliary canons, decretal epistles of the Popes, and patristic dicta. A few particulars from the teachings of this main prop and enforcer of the Papal pretensions will suffice to show you its character. It declares that the Pope as God is irresponsible to man, and that human powers constitutions and laws are subordinate to his will; (1) and it claims for the Pope a certain supreme power of judging and disposing of all the temporal goods of all Christians. It enacts the persecution of heretics (2) (or Protestants) by excommunication, loss of civil and parental rights, imprisonment, confiscation of goods, and death, and declares that they who kill heretics (or Protestants) are not guilty of homicide, or murder (3). It further claims for the Pope the power of deposing princes, and absolving their subjects from oaths of allegiance (4). It lays down the position in these very words, that "an oath taken against the church's interest is not binding" (5). Such are specimens of the unchanged, and indeed unchangable law of Rome, "many of whose provisions," says Dr. Twiss, "are at variance with the institutions of free and independent kingdoms, and sap the foundations of the pillars of obedience to the law of the land, upon which the safety of states rests, and while advancing the most extravagant claims for the Popedom, interfere with every human right, claim, property, franchise or feeling at variance thereto."

"These canons and epistles were first compiled by Isidore of Seville, and afterwards enlarged by Anselm of Lucca, and reduced to system by Gratian of Bologna, (A. D. 1142). Subsequently additions were made by Gregory IX. (A. D. 1230), Boniface VIII. (A. D. 1299), Clement V. (A. D. 1311), and John XXII. (A. D. 1317). † All of which decrees, you perceive by the dates of compilation given, were enacted hundreds of years before Loyola and Jesuitism had an existence. If then, fellow-countrymen, you would find God underlying this Protestant movement in Ontario and other parts of the Dominion against the Jesuits, as the wounded French soldier said of the Emperor "Bony," you must "go a little deeper" than some are wont to go; and there you will doubtless find Him ready to upheave the whole Jesuitical and Papistical substratum, and to doom it to utter destruction.

The general sympathy and cooperation of Roman Catholics with Protestants in connection with this movement, however, is out of the question, and will be looked for in vain whatever attitude Protestant agitators of this question may assume towards them. Ill-deserved flattery may not be altogether uncongenial to the better class of Roman Catholics; but daubing them with conciliatory mortar of this nature will not do—the plaster will not stick. They may receive a "dispensation" from pope or priest to "assume any religion, or *masked* attitude, to accomplish an end; but it is utterly inconsistent with the inculcated and universally received principles of Roman Catholics to sincerely unite with Protestants upon a question of this nature.

(1) See Decret., P. I. Dist. X. Dist. 19, c. 22. Dist. 96, c. 8. (2) See Decret. Greg. IX. lib. 5, tit. VII., c. 9, 10, 13. (3) See Decret. P. II. Caus. 23, Q. v. c. 46. (4) See Decret. Greg. IX. lib. 5, tit. 7, c. 13. (5) See Decret. Greg. IX., tit. 24, c. 27. † Kidd's "Errors of Romanism," p. 133.



It should be observed also in this connection, that the Jesuits, although, as the *Toronto Mail* expresses it, "kicked out of every Roman Catholic country in the world, because of the intolerable curse they have always proved to be, both to society and the state," it has not been done by pope and cardinal, but by the civil authorities. Lay influence, backed, in some instances, by jealous orders, bishops, and priests, have effected their removal. From such motives, some of the Roman Catholic bishops are said to have opposed their recent incorporation in Canada. But in no case, as it respects the Roman Catholic clergy, may their banishment be traced to purely moral and religious principle. The fundamental principles of the Order, base and wicked as they are, are entirely Roman Catholic; and hence no sincere "Catholic" can consistently, and from pure churchly motives, oppose Jesuitism, except, indeed, to promote its nefarious churchly ends relative to the overthrow of Protestantism and Protestant governments, it be a Jesuitically feigned and not a real opposition. If some Roman Catholics are really found to co-operate with the Protestant movement against the Jesuits, it is not, of course, to help Protestants or Protestantism, but from purely Romish or personally interested motives. And although we do not affirm it to have been the case with the Quebec dignitaries, even a cardinal or a bishop's opposition to their incorporation could, from well-known motives of Roman policy, have been feigned. To oppose Jesuitism is to oppose Romanism; and any man that will do that, be he lay or clerical, is not, in a Romish sense, a "good Catholic."

The Rev. Dr. White said before an audience at Ottawa, that "whilst there is no disposition to interfere with the religious liberties of the Roman Catholic citizens, we are determined to resist Jesuit aggression in Canada; and I am sure there will be no retreat from the stand taken." To "resist Jesuit aggression," we reply, is to resist Roman aggression; and we should "interfere" with Romanists in the exercise of their religion, because it is the professed and acknowledged province and aim of their "religious liberties" to interfere with the religious liberties of Protestants, and this Jesuit demand for incorporation and a Jesuit Estates Act, is but the legitimate or natural outcome of Roman Catholic principles and unceasing aims; and because, also, this is but one, and one, too, of the minor features of its developement which will continue to be manifested and imposed upon the world, as it has opportunity, while it continues to have any existence.

But what, may I ask, have we lately beheld in the Dominion Parliament of Canada, as connected with the discussion and disposition of this all-important matter? Thirteen loyal representatives, nobly standing up for Protestant rights, as against 188 Protestant traitors bowing the knee to Jesuitism and endorsing it for the sake of its political Grit or Tory vote! thus placing unendowed Protestantism at a great and most unjust disadvantage, and taking the *initiative* in placing Protestantism and the country at the disposal of the Jesuits and the Pope! And in thus endowing Jesuitism or Romanism, at the public expense and with the public funds, it has diverted them from the purposes of higher education, to the endowment of an institution which, by its declared constitution and aims, is traitorous to the sovereign of the realm, and

inimical to all the best interests of the state, civil no less than religious !

Thus, as in many other ways, are not only the Protestants of Quebec, but the Protestants of every Province in the Dominion, made to suffer as to their "equal rights" which, to say the very least, are being justly contended for at the present time by the country. But notwithstanding all that has been hitherto said and published on the subject, Col Amyot, who is the Editor of the French Canadian *La Justice*, says : "Not a word has been given which would be of a nature to establish that the English and Protestant element have suffered in its rights and privileges !" Not a word of such a nature that you are aware of, you might perhaps with more show of truthfulness have said, Colonel. But we advise you for your information and edification on this subject, of which you appear at present to be so ignorant, to read the public and published speeches of Dr. McVicar and others. And for your further-enlightenment on the general state of Quebec as a Roman ruled Province, and its connection with Ontario and the Dominion, we will insert here a very brief quotation from the *Toronto Mail*, advising you to read carefully the whole of the article as contained in the issue of July 18th, 1889 : "Putting the Pope's dictum aside, it is not conceivable that any sane man who might be charged to day with the task of fashioning institutions for Quebec could be guilty of saddling it with a medievalism which is no longer allowed to cumber the ground in those old European countries where it had its origin, and where it may have served a purpose when civilization was young and crude. THE MAIL and its friends say that that particular *ism* should be remorselessly wiped out, the connection between Church and State severed, clerical censorship of the press and clerical control of the ballot box abolished, and with them all those ecclesiastical pretensions which fetter or diminish the freedom of the individual and the supremacy of the State \* \* But, it is said, Ontario has no right to interfere in Quebec affairs. That was the cry of the Southern slave owner who insisted that the right of property in man was a domestic institution with which the North had nothing to do. Ontario, however, has a very direct and tangible interest in Quebec. We are interested, or ought to be, in the welfare of that and every other portion of the Dominion, first, because a part cannot be injured without injury to the whole ; secondly, because as the principal taxpayers we have a right to say that a system which impoverishes one-third of the population and compels it to appear at Ottawa, sometimes in *forma pauperis* and sometimes with a club in its hand, to beg or exact better terms and grants for local works which, if the *habitant* were not picked to the bone, could and should be carried out by the municipalities if at all, is a burden upon us and our future ; and lastly, because as Canadians we are entitled to demand the removal of this blot upon the fame of the country, and to declare that here every man shall be free under the usual conditions to think what he pleases, to say what he thinks, and to enjoy the fruit of his toil without having, by Roman and clerical compulsion, to divide it with another."

We remember your history of the past, Colonel ; therefore are we ill at ease under your present Jesuitical maneuvering. We do not say your history as Frenchmen, but as Romanists. Because the country is contending for equal Church rights and no State favoritism, either you,

or one of your number, is said to have even spoken threateningly of raising the "tri-colored flag!" Raise it, if you will, and we will raise the Confederate Union Jack and conquer you again; and this time, not only your nationality, but your religion shall be conquered. But enough at present with you. You charge Protestants with "thank-ing God that they are not as other men." Well, it were a pity indeed if they were as you Romanists are, and always have been! They have indeed good reason to thank God, that, by his Grace, they are not and never were as you—dark, benighted, covetous, false, bloodthirsty, ignorantly superstitious, and anti-christian in all the far-reaching results of your hierarchical doings, past and present!

We will here give an appropriate extract or two from the published speeches of Dr. MacVicar, President of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, as delivered by him at the Toronto Convention and at Ottawa: " \* \* \* I mentioned in the afternoon that we have grievances in Quebec that are but little known beyond its limits. Some of them referred to by one speaker can only be dealt with by the process of enlightenment and education on the part of the people, so as to bring them to the proper point to demand their rights and to cast off all sorts of yokes of an ecclesiastical character. But there are other grievances outstanding. One is that the higher education fund of the Province of Quebec should have been subverted by the obnoxious Act we are now discussing. Another grievance is the state of the school law. The taxes levied for school purposes are put into three panels, the Roman Catholic panel, the Protestant panel, and the neutral panel. Into the first of these the taxes raised upon Roman Catholic property are put. Into the second the taxes raised upon the property of Protestants are put; and into the third the taxes raised upon such property as stocks of banks and other companies. These last class of taxes are divided according to population. The population in the city of Montreal is Roman Catholic to the extent of about four to one. On the other hand some say that nine-tenths of the stocks are owned by Protestants. The result is that in Montreal the Protestants are forced to contribute between ten and twelve thousand dollars per annum to the Roman Catholic schools. We have demanded redress in this matter but are denied it for the extraordinary reason that the Council of Public Instruction comes between us and the Parliament. I have no less than three letters from Mr. Mercier saying that we can expect no change until the Council of Public Instruction first agree to the change. I have answered that no body of men should come between the people and their representatives in Parliament. I venture to say that the people of this Country are not in accord with the mind of the 188 members of Parliament who some time ago voted that things should remain as they are. We have tried to remedy this evil in the Legislature of Quebec, and if we fail again we will go to the Parliament at Ottawa under the B. N. A. Act and ask for redress in this matter, so that Roman Catholics may receive their own taxes and Protestants their own taxes for school purposes. You will see that the grievance is a serious one when I tell you that the Council of Public Instruction is composed of the Cardinal, ten Roman Catholic Bishops, with as many more as may hereafter be appointed, ten Roman Catholics appointed by



the Government, and ten Protestants. You can see that it is hopeless to expect redress from such a source.

We deem it a great grievance that public money in the form of an educational fund should be taken to endow any religious body, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant. We are opposed to the endowment of such bodies. We deem it dangerous and injurious to take a fund and place it at the disposal of the Pope, and that he should be able to do what he pleases with it. The Act also contains what might be called prospective benefits for the Jesuits, which have in a measure escaped observation. They are in future, whenever they require it, to have money for education, colonization, etc. We deem it a grievance that there should be upon the statute books a law which stands as a law simply because it has been ratified by a foreign potentate. The Act says the law cannot be law until it is ratified by the Pope. What if he had never ratified it? It would never have been law. If he had never distributed the money then the Act would have been good for nothing. But conversely, seeing he has ratified the Act, the Province of Quebec presents a spectacle to the whole world of a British Province having upon its statute books a law which has become a law simply by the word of a foreign potentate. Now for some specific grievance. I speak upon this point with some hesitation before so many lawyers. We have several communities which are civilly dead, that is, they cannot be called upon in courts to give evidence. A lawyer told me, "We have tried to bring them into court, but in virtue of their constitution and vows we cannot do so." I hold that to be a grievance, that a community should be allowed to exist and not be subject to the civil laws of the land. Another grievance is that the degrees of the Protestant Universities were utterly degraded in the Province. The holder of a B. A. degree could not qualify to begin the study of law or medicine until he had first studied moral philosophy as taught in the Jesuit College. [That is simply outrageous, and ought certainly to be immediately set right through the influence of the Dominion Parliament.] Was the design of this not clear? It was to exalt and promote the interests of the Catholic Colleges at the expense of the Protestant seats of learning. There are also numerous lands owned by this body which are free from taxation. This, we say is unjust, and we are determined to do all in our power to rectify the evil. The Bishop of Three Rivers has stated as his conviction that the Church has the right to have all her property exempt from civil taxation, whether they be used for church purposes or otherwise. I consider that such a state of things is a great grievance. I know that it is most unfair that it should be so. I hold that any church or any community holding property should bear their legitimate share of the burdens of taxation.

The Doctor having referred to their system of tithing and the existence of a "State Church" among them as additional grievances draining the people of their hard earnings and crippling the energies of the Dominion, concluded a very excellent address by saying, "I shall close, as I commenced, by expressing my hope and belief that this agitation will go on until the wrongs which have given it birth have been swept away, and men are put in power who won't be afraid to do that which is right."

To the above we may add the following pertinent observations by the Rev. Wm. Galbraith, pastor of the Methodist Church, who has had nine years experience in the Province of Quebec. He said that "Some years ago there was a Defence Alliance formed in the City of Montreal. It was felt that the aggressions of the Romish Church were such that the Protestants would have to resort to some law for the purpose of self-protection, and in some measure to check the rapid progress of Romanism. The ministers of the several different denominations and prominent laymen met together accordingly and established this alliance, which continued in existence for some years, and is probably still in useful operation. The English minority in the Province of Quebec generally felt that their rights were being stealthily and generally encroached upon. The impression was that the Romish Church was making the aggression just as rapidly as they could without occasioning very serious friction. The Catholic Church claimed that they had rights in regard to all religious matters secured to them by the treaty by which the Province of Quebec was ceded to the British. They claimed that they had the right to have processions, obstructing the traffic of the business thoroughfares on their festive days which about filled up all the days in the calendar. On these days they interfered with the Protestant minority just as much as they felt disposed. The Protestants felt on the other hand, that in this treaty the British did not concede any rights and privileges to the Roman Catholic Church beyond those which were given to the Protestants, and this was a great conflict between the two religionists. The Romish Church to-day was not as intolerant in carrying out these observances as in the past. A few years ago if a Protestant did not take off his hat on the street as the procession passed, it would be knocked off with religious fervour and a good deal of lingual enthusiasm. The Catholics thought the Protestants had no right to form such processions in the streets. This was evidenced a few years ago when they refused the right to the Orangemen, and shot down Hackett. Another thing the church of Rome claimed was that if a Catholic and Protestant were united in marriage, the marriage was illegal if performed by a Protestant minister. The Catholic Courts in the Province of Quebec had sustained the contention of the church in this respect. Another great grievance of the Protestant community was the way in which the school sections were divided up by the Catholic archbishop. The church had the right to determine the boundaries of the school sections and divided them up so as to give the Catholics a majority in each section, in order to obtain control. The Catholics thus obtained a hold of the public schools, and if the Protestants did not want to submit to this domination they were obliged to resort to separate schools. Another just cause of complaint was, that in any litigation between Protestants and Catholics the juries were actually packed with Catholics, and it was impossible to rely upon obtaining any measure of justice from the French Catholics when a Protestant was involved in the case. The Jesuit incorporation was opposed by the Protestant minority, but in consequence of their business interests and political relations they were afraid to speak out what they actually felt. The feeling of the Protestants could not be judged in Ontario from the silence of the Protestant minority in Quebec in the Provin-

cial Parliament, because when the the Church was involved in any question the Protestants were practically gagged, owing to their peculiar position and the power wielded by the Pope. A word from the Church and many business men would lose all their patronage, and would be ruined. They were thus unable to speak out frankly and fully their sentiments on this question. If a French Canadian became converted to Protestantism he was immediately ostracized, and commercially or professionally ruined. This accounted in some measure for the small progress made by the French missions. Nearly all those who were converted were obliged to seek a livelihood in the United States. The French were multiplying amazingly, and were encroaching upon the eastern portion of Ontario and spreading rapidly along the line of the C. P. R. It was time that Ontario began to take some precautionary measures to prevent this continued aggression, he feared that it would culminate in a civil war before many years longer."

In view of the state of things recently developed, we may here observe, the public schools throughout the Dominion should be all nationalized; no separate schools should be allowed in any part of the Dominion except in the Province of Quebec; nor should teaching in the French language be allowed in the common schools in any part of the Dominion except Quebec, and there only for the present—the English should be there gradually and compulsorily substituted for the French. It should, however, be taught as soon as teachers can be qualified for it, in all the public schools in Quebec, and no book should be used in any public school which has not been approved by the Minister of Education. Influential Romanists have been pleased to object to the use of books in the Ontario public schools which inculcate Protestant doctrine; surely, then, they will not object to the exclusion from the public schools of Quebec all books which in any way inculcate Roman Catholic doctrine. To thus suppose and thus reason, however, would argue an utter ignorance of the moral principles by which not only the order of Jesuits, but the entire Romish hierarchy are guided. *Compulsion* to the right, is in their case, absolutely indispensable; they must be compelled to do the just and righteous thing, or they will never do it.

The French language in Canada should and must be doomed. This is an absolute necessity in order to the attainment of the highest position of national greatness and success of which we are capable. And so, sooner or later, must not only Jesuitism but Romanism be doomed as an insufferable bane to the country, to humanity, and the world. And as an offset to their "festive" impudence and audacity in connection with their processions, as referred to by Mr. Galbraith, I may here further observe, that their Church processions should be by law suppressed, while the processions of all Protestant societies should be legalized and encourage.

Do not, however, misunderstood me, I say here, as I have said before, that overlooking its absurdities, if harmless, I would be tolerant of the tolerant; but it is not wisely expedient or safe, as it regards the peace and well being of humanity, to tolerate those who by the declared principles of their very constitution and religion are intolerant. Let us, then, awake to our duty; there is nothing to be gained by being supinely indifferent, nor by giving an uncertain sound as to our being



longer disposed to tolerate the intolerant ; but in view of its ominous encroachments, on the principle of self-defence, seeing the venomous snake stealthily creeping towards us under cover of the grass, let us haste to put our foot upon it, or otherwise destroy it, before it gets into position to thrust at us its fatal fang ! Let us have no more of its silly absurdities, its pagan superstitions, and atrocious wickedness, under cover of religion, and even in the name of the Gospel of Liberty and Love ! If, however, we continue to tolerate an unconcealed, publicly expressed, popishly designed, and clearly defined intolerance, we need not be surprised if, before very long, we find ourselves again shackled with the bonds of Romish imposition and aggression, and fast bound by the Roman fetters which are being, at the present time, industriously prepared for us ! Do not imagine that this is impossible, or that its attempt is impossible, in the present day ; for if the Protestant world go on tolerating and encouraging Romanism as it has been of late years, the utter overthrow of Protestantism, which is contemplated by Rome, will, I believe, only be averted by a general war, involving much carnage and bloodshed.

I am not myself an Orangeman ; but I think, as an anti-Romish institution, Orangeism should nowhere be discountenanced. Their principles and aims as an Order are, I believe, good ; and if they practice and live up to them they will do well. Their public processions should everywhere throughout Protestant countries be legalized, and their public celebrations in every city, town, and village, encouraged, so long as the smallest remnant of Popery exists ; and even when Pope Despot is no more, and his office of Peter-pence notoriety and imposition is defunct, the existence of the Order, at least for a time, will do no harm. The poor self-deceived, deluded Romanists have celebrated even such infernal achievements as the Bartholomew massacre and other kindred inhuman and diabolical butcheries ; why then may not Orangemen and others gladly, and lawfully, and with general encouragement, in view of its consequences, not only to the British nation but to the Christian world, celebrate the greatest religious military achievement of modern times ? Undying honor to King William of Orange, I say, and thanks to all those who keep up the remembrance of his name. And may the time come, when Romanists that were shall join in brotherly unity the processions of Orangemen, and as gladly, and as loyally to the true principles of common sense, intelligence, humanity, the Christian religion, and the untrammelled liberty of the Gospel, celebrate with them an achievement which comprises within its all-embracing scope the entire human race, with all its very best and highest interests both for time and eternity, for this world and the next !

The Rev. J. Murray, in a speech delivered, June 3rd, at London, Ont., said, "he would like to see every one of the 188 men who voted the Jesuit ticket left at home. They might not be able to accomplish this in full perhaps, but he hoped they would"; and so do I. Others also, including the Rev. Dr. Wild of Toronto, recommend the country to "turn them all out." And truly it is high time that they were, when parliamentary corruption and want of principle among them has become so rampant and general as to be in the proportion of 188 to a baker's dozen ! Sir John, I believe, calls the loyal 13 "the devil's dozen !" But in this, all the world must see that he, in the interests of

his master, and in imitation of the old usurper and liar, claims for him what does not rightly belong to him ; or if they do, at any rate in this case, they voted to a man against him ; while Sir John and his numerous associates in the "broad way" voted for him. This honorable old intriguer, I may add, is, I fear, in moral principle, more than half a Jesuit himself ; but Jesuit or Jew—and although helped by myself into office at the last election but one—having been traitorous to his sacred trust, he deserves to be incarcerated and have nothing given him to eat but the "little bit of pork" to which he refers as being forbidden to the Jew, and to which he lightly compares "all this row," made about the bit of money unlawfully given to the Jesuits—he deserves, I say, to be literally incarcerated, and so fed, until this most obnoxious, most unjust, as well as unconstitutional Estates Act be disallowed or repealed.

Mr. J. Sutherland, M. P., while heroically supporting the Protestant claim to "equal rights," and is favorable, as I also am, to all "rights" that really are such, said, however, at the great Protestant Convention held in Toronto : "You must be careful and generous in dealing with your representatives. In both political parties there are men true to the best interests of the country." He should have said, "true to *some* of the best interests of the country." The politician, being Protestant, who so far truckles to a Roman Catholic as to solicit his vote, is not worthy of the name Protestant. True Protestants and Protestantism can govern the country in all its interests independently of the Catholic vote, and, being united and true to their Protestant principles, will not solicit it. But touching the great question of questions now agitating the public mind, and which above all others affects the vital interests of the country, the great, the overwhelming majority of our present representatives have proved themselves recreant in the discharge of their duty as Protestant citizens and Protestant representatives of a Protestant country, and where Protestant state principles should of course be made to universally prevail. It is said, however, that there are as good fish in the sea as were ever taken out of it ; and there are as good and true men in the country, and who will be truer to the most important interests of the Dominion, as parliamentary representatives, than were those 188, who sold Protestantism and their Protestant country, as such, for a Judas's Kiss from the Pope, and the coveted "thirty pieces of silver" from his emissaries ! Therefore, I say, ought these rebels against Protestantism, every one of them, to be turned out ; and if they still further do as Judas did, after being condemned, they will be still more completely out of the way. But failing in this, as they probably have not the pluck (moral or immoral) that Judas had, Premier Macdonald and the rest of the 188, as accomplices of Mr. Mercier, might thereupon, according to British law, (13th Elizabeth, chap. 2, Section III) as shown in reference to Mr. Mercier in particular, by Mr. Charlton, M. P., in his able speech before the Toronto Convention, be arrested for *high treason*, and be thus summarily disposed of as enemies and traitors to the Queen's Supremacy and the sovereignty of British sway in this Dominion. What we want to represent us is *men of principle*, men who will not truckle along the floor of the House, and rest beseech

ingly at the feet of a Roman Catholic, be he Grit or Conservative for his vote—MEN OF PRINCIPLE.

The endowment of religious error and Romanism, ill becomes a professedly Christian nation and government. But we have through our supineness, been hoodwinked and deceived into it by the sly, artful, wily machinations, of "the man of sin." Dr. McNeil, in a lecture delivered before the Young Men's Christian Association, Exeter Hall, London, well says, in referring to their tactics in England, "A general feeling existed that our Protestantism was perfectly secure; and this produced a corresponding feeling that controversy against Romanism was altogether needless. Under cover of this ignorance and apathy, the Papal hierarchy, by denying upon oath before committees of the British Parliament those obnoxious principles of perfidy and intolerance to which they are pledged upon oath in their own system, contrived to present themselves and their people before the nation under the engaging aspect of persons injured and oppressed because of their religious opinions. Sympathy was excited. Concessions were made. England, anxious to be liberal as well as kind, broke down her constitutional defences. The few faithful watchmen who sounded an alarm were discountenanced as impracticable bigots, and the sworn enemies of our country were admitted to the full enjoyment of her dearest and most powerful privileges. Facts are eloquent and convincing. The removal of political disabilities was one thing. The endowment of religious error is quite another thing. The connection between the two was denied. Now it is seen. \* \* With an imposing claim to immutability, and a real readiness to act, as opportunity may serve, on the most obnoxious of her decrees, Romanism does nevertheless present a more than chameleon aspect, changing her color, shape, and voice, in plastic adaptation to surrounding circumstances. Diluted down to the verge of mere negation, or misrepresented by artful and arbitrary suppression, in the discourses of Dr. Wiseman and other men of the times, Romanism wears a mask for the deception of the unwary. This wily versatility in her administration must not be lost sight of in considering the characteristics of Romanism; though by the term I would rather be understood to mean the system itself, *as it is*, when nothing is to be gained by concealment or hypocrisy; the system as developed in canons, catechisms, and decretals; matured under Gregory VII; consolidated under Clement, Adrian, and Inocent; and stereotyped at Trent."

You have hence a duty fellow Protestants to perform; be determined to unflinchingly perform it. And the best way to do it is, as Mr. J. L. Hughes suggested in a speech which he delivered at Shelburne. He said that at the next election "he would vote for a man pledged against the Jesuits;" and so say I; and so, I think, will every truly enlightened and right principled Protestant, untrammelled by party prejudice or the love of pelf, say. This gentleman says also, "Turn them all out—all except the noble 13;" and so, I say again, they all ought to be, and I trust will be. Protestant party papers, however, I observe, are still going in for their party politics—still persistently and bigotedly, and selfishly talking, and endeavoring to influence their readers and the general public in the interests of their party Gritism or Toryism, to the all but entire exclusion of all the



higher interests of the country, as connected with Protestantism, Anti-Romanism, unincorporated and unendowed Orangeism, incorporated and endowed Jesuitism, etc.

But what, may we ask, are our very wise politicians allowing, and even directly causing our country to come to?—first a concession is made to Rome and the Jesuits in reference to the administering of the Lieutenant Governor's oath of induction to office, and of allegiance to the British Crown; next comes Jesuit incorporation; then Government patronizing Anti-Protestant, Jesuit endowment; and what next? Permission to use the rack and thumbscrew, perhaps—instruments with which the notorious Sir John, with his cabinet and the balance of the 188, should be made severally and Jesuitically acquainted at this particular juncture of the country's Grit and Tory Romanizing development! The acquaintance would doubtless operate as a seasonable reminder to them.

There is a Roman Catholic party already formed and established in the House, and who, I fear, as such, are as bigoted as Jews; let there be an anti-Catholic party formed to meet them—a fourth independent party large enough to control alike Catholic members and the truckling Grit or Conservative party, who are recreant in reference to this matter of Romish aggression, and who may again contrive to secure for themselves a place in the House after the dissolution of Parliament next ensuing. Although I do not profess to know much about politics, I think the voters, by pledging the various candidates for nomination at the next election, can make this very possible.

We may here further observe, that the Jesuit Order, being, as the result both of the edict of the Pope and a warrant of the British Crown, *extinct*, every then existing Jesuit being also by the British Government provided for until death, their land having been thus lawfully escheated to the crown for a period of upwards of one hundred years, and devoted by imperial authority to the purposes of higher education, surely no colonial government has a constitutional right to divert it from such object and devote it to any purpose inimical to the general interests of the crown and country; much less to bestow it upon a *sectarian* politico-religious hierarchy, whose interests, aims, and purposes, are wholly alien, and confessedly antagonistic to Protestant rule, the Protestant Crown, and our Protestant Church and State.

Estimated by its wealth, the French Catholic Church in the Province of Quebec possesses enormous power. Having a revenue derived from the people, estimated at \$12,000,000, it also possesses property worth \$10,000,000, every cent of which is anti-Protestant, and all of which is exempt from taxation, and unjustly so to the Protestant public. And still they are coveting more. The Jesuits income alone, as the Rev. Principal MacVicar told the people at Ottawa, amounted at the time of their incorporation to \$300,000. Money is power; and they doubtless shrewdly, as well as wickedly, have an eye to it for purposes of future and further unlawful aggression. On the principle, no doubt, of an arsenal, or a military reserve, they are enlarging their estates, increasing their revenues, and heaping together this important and ever available "root" of their ceaselessly designed "evil," with a view to their all the more easily effecting a future political as well as ecclesiastical conquest of Canada. Hence it is that, as Hallam well

says, "their ecclesiastical encroachments are what civil Governments and the laity in general have to steadfastly resist." Hence also we say, with the Rev. Hugh Johnston in addressing an audience at Ottawa, "although a man of peace, we say solemnly that if the relinquishment of liberty was to be the price of peace, then welcome war." Our Protestant friend, Sir John, however, backed by his associates, has, under Jesuitical counsel we may presume, taken timely precaution against such an event by placing a Roman Catholic at the head of the war or military department—a stroke of Jesuitical policy which is also, no doubt, very considerate of our good Protestant Premier!

Rome's good will towards Protestants, Pope Urban III. thus expresses in few words: "They are so far from being guilty of murder that kill any who are excommunicate, (and all Protestants are excommunicate,) that they are bound to exterminate heretics, as they would be esteemed Christians themselves." And their learned Cardinal Bellarmine, one of the greatest oracles of Popery, teaches in reference to Protestant heretics, so called, that "they are to be destroyed root and branch, if it can possibly be done; but if it appear that the Catholics are so few that they cannot, consistently with their own safety, attempt such a thing, then it is best, in such a case, to be quiet; lest, upon opposition made by the heretics, the Catholics should be worsted." *Parker's "Annals of the Church," p. 285.* What do you think of that, Sir John & Company? Little you care, perhaps, so long as they have a monastery or a nunnery to stuff you into out the way, until the storm blows over! Such, however, is Jesuitical and "Catholic" Romanism. And as not one of their persecuting canons and decrees is either rescinded or officially deplored, even to the present day, the "Catholic Emancipation Bill" in England, ought never to have been passed, and their disabilities in Canada should never have been removed. Nor should a Roman Catholic be allowed to be a member of Parliament in any Protestant country. I see, however, that in "Catholic" circles, they are even seriously discussing the question of bringing the Pope to London, England. I trust they may, and put him into the Tower, where all the others might have been put, very much to the world's advantage. The present trouble with the Jesuits and Roman Catholics in England, Ireland, and Canada, is the direct result of past impolitic and unwise legislation on the part of British statesmen, Mr. Gladstone included! Instead of loosening them, their fetters should have been riveted and fastened on them still more closely. We know from experience that bears, wolves, and Christian hyenas, (whose bloodthirsty characteristics we have just seen described both by Pope Urban and Bellarmine,) are not safe animals to leave unchained.

The publication of this pamphlet having been delayed by the printers for a short time, It has afforded me an opportunity of reading and offering a few remarks on the speech of the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, as delivered on the evening of September 30, under the auspices of the Young Men's Liberal Club, Toronto. With the gentleman's "Free Trade" views, as therein expressed, I quite agree; but touching the questions of Jesuit Incorporation and Endowment, and the true position (arising from their dread of being commercially or professionally ruined,) of the much hampered Protestant minority who represent, or



should represent Protestant interests in the Quebec Legislature, I cannot agree. Entirely inexcusable under the circumstances they may not be, but blamable from a moral and religious standpoint they certainly are. If, however, as men of the world, they would seek Rome's patronage they must of necessity truckle to Rome. Such is the ordination of the hierarchy.

French Canadian Roman Catholics, as Mr. Galbraith assures us *ostracize* converted Christian Protestants, simply and solely because they have become such. Ostracism, however, is not it appears, approved by Mr. Laurier; but it is rampant among his fellow countrymen of the "Catholic faith" in the Province of Quebec, nevertheless; and this "faith" being professedly *Christian*, such ostracism is of itself a telling argument in proof that Romanism is not even a *plausible counterfeit* of the religion of Christ; for, although inculcated by Romanists and Romanism, it is utterly repugnant to the true spirit of Christianity. Because French Canadians, who become Protestants, are converted from Romanism to Christianity, they are thus mercilessly dealt with and persecuted. But Christ says, "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness sake for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad for great is your reward in Heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." Now who are the recognized children of God here, the persecutors or the persecuted? The persecuted certainly—those who are converted to Christ and His gospel, and who take the Word of God as the man of their counsel and the guide of their life. When Paul was in an unsaved state he was a persecutor; but when he became converted to Christ and the true spirit of the Gospel, he ceased to be a persecutor. And so every man who is truly converted to God, and is imbued with the spirit of the Gospel, does not and will not persecute any man for his religion. But *denouncing* Ostracism, Mr. Laurier cannot be a "good" member of this very "Catholic" faith and church; because, is it not a law of the Hierarchy and a legalized custom of the Romish church that all excommunicated persons be ostracized. All *auto-da-fée* and other martyrs were ostracized; and so were all deposed kings so far as pope, canon, and priest could do it. But if those days of popish despotism have "forever passed away," as Mr. Laurier appears to think, no thanks to Pope or Popery for the change, for they would most certainly bring them back again if they could. Pope is not only palace-imprisoned against his will, but Popery is also shackled against her will. But her days of wicked triumph and of native revelry and glee are, we trust, numbered. The glutted old "beast" we would gladly hope, will never again feed on human gore; but she would if she could, and she will if she can; her grinders may have been worn to stumps, but her nature is not changed. She still sits upon the seven hills watching her pray, and as eagerly and omnivorously as ever!

By the expulsion of the *Jesuit* from any country, he is not persecuted for his *religion*, so called, but is simply punished with banishment because he is himself a persecutor whenever and wherever he is able; and because he is withal a criminally meddlesome, and an



inveterate, unreclaimable busybody in other men's matters, including matters of State as well as all others, civil and religious. The good example of France and other countries should therefore be followed, either in their extinction as such, or in their expulsion both from England and Canada. But, says Mr. Laurier, "dangerous and bad men have rights which good men are bound to recognize." True; but they are the rights of criminals to their chains and their cells.

Your recent legislation in favor of the Jesuits is entirely anti-Protestant, and wholly in the interest of "Catholic" church domination. You have thereby, Mr. Laurier, with your associate colleagues, most unjustly as well as unwisely furnished the Jesuits and Ultramontanes, enemies alike of freedom, religion, and the world, with weapons of offence and defence; and which you, Sir, as well as all "Liberals" and "Conservatives," ought to know they will not scruple nor be slow to wield as opportunity may serve them.

The Acts of Jesuit Incorporation and Endowment, moreover, are clearly unconstitutional, and admitted to be so by Mr. Laurier himself, inasmuch as he says, "In England you will find old laws still unrepealed that might be revived to deal out to the Jesuits the same fate as was meted out to them in France." And so, as we have said, they certainly ought to be dealt with, both in England, her Colonies, and the United States. But what though the Acts be thus shown to be clearly unconstitutional, what is that to Mr. Laurier and his associates in the evil work? To strive to retain, or to strive to get into the possession of power and pelf is not unconstitutional; and so the unconstitutionality of the one is met by the constitutionality of the other, and who therefore has reason to complain? Honest constitutionality all round is, I suppose, too much to expect from existing interested politicians. But if so, it is time that a new race of them were created.

"I know," says Mr. Laurier, "that there is no man of British blood, be his position ever so humble, or the range of his comprehension ever so limited, who would at any time allow the sway of the Pope in temporal affairs in England." And yet by this Jesuit Estates Act, you solicit the interference and acknowledge "the sway of the Pope in temporal affairs" *in Canada*! This is Mr. Laurier's mode of "following the example of the British," which as to its "Liberalism" as contrasted with the "Liberalism" of France, he professes to love so much. Again, the Hon. gentleman says: "If you believe that it was ever the intention of any Roman Catholic in Lower Canada to put the supremacy of the Pope over that of the Queen, then I disclaim in the most emphatic manner any such intention. For there is no Christian organization in which Christ's good precept, 'Render unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things which are God's,' is so rigidly enforced as in the Catholic religion." It is easy to make assertions, Mr. Laurier, but it is not always so easy to prove them in accordance with fact. Does not the obnoxious Estates Act, with the use that is made of the Pope's name in its preamble, whatever the "intention" of its authors may have been, clearly "put the supremacy of the Pope over that of the Queen?" The plain word in-  
ing of the hierarchical and now legalized document is against you, Sir.

And are not the canons and decretal epistles of your church, as well as the Syllabus of Pope Pious 9 and the more recent Encyclicals of Pope Leo 13, also notoriously against you as to the recognized supremacy of the Pope over all Kings and Queens; and hence as to the Popish interpretation and design of this and all kindred Acts? They are indeed! We might refer you to page 9 of this pamphlet (which is already through the press) for references to authoritative proof; but we will here add that the decree of Pope Gregory VII. was, that "all kings and princes should hold their crowns from St. Peter," or the Pope; that all the Popes, being linked in the infallible chain, teach the same; and that the Popish writers of recognized authority in the "church" coincide with them. History and the published writings and authoritative records of your church, Sir, forbid you to deny this. Dr. Moriarty, of your church, says: "If the Prince rebel in such *temporal matters* as are subject to the authority of the church how much more so if he fall into heresy. . . . When Kings renounce the name of God and lead their people to destruction, the vicar of Christ by reason of his supreme responsibility, and consequent sovereignty, deposes the godless king and absolves the people from their oath of allegiance." Nor has the "Catholic" church renounced an iota of this claim to the present day. No longer, then, talk about the supremacy of your Pope not taking the precedence of the Queen, because it is not in accordance with fact, and is entirely misleading. Your carefully worded assertion relative to the Roman Catholic church "rendering to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God (i. e., to the Pope, His assumed vicegerent,) the things that are God's," does not contravene the fact that the Pope's supremacy figures very prominently in the Quebec Jesuit Estates Act. Nor does it contravene the fact that the Government of your own Fatherland has published to the world in the form of extracts from Jesuitical writings, entitled "*Extraits des Assertions Dangereuses et Pernicieuses*," that they teach, among other equally objectionable things, that "The spiritual power may change kingdoms, and take them from one to transfer them to another if it should be necessary for the salvation of souls. Christians may not tolerate an infidel or heretic king, if he endeavors to draw his subjects to his heresy." *Lib 5, c. 7, p. 891—Bellarmine*. The celebrated Jesuit writer, Suarez, also teaches as follows: "After sentence has been pronounced, he (i. e., a king who has been deposed,) is entirely deprived of his kingdom. He may therefore from that time be treated in all respects as a tyrant, and he may consequently be killed by any individual." And again, "Destroy, proscribe, your heretic kings, who refuse to be corrected, and who are pernicious to their subjects in matters pertaining to the Catholic faith" *F. Suarez, Def. Fid. Cath. et Cathol, lib III. c. II. n. 6*.

The Parliament of France, in 1762, published and presented to the king similar extracts from no less than 147 Popish authors of celebrity. Such, then, is the Pope's way, and the way the Roman Catholic "religion" has, and always has had, of "rendering to Cesar the things that are Cesar's"; so that, making the necessary deductions per favor of the Pope, as required by their canon laws, etc., there is clearly very little of sovereignty and none of "supremacy" left for poor Cesar! To King and Queen, Pope Despot, in view of his "supreme

responsibility," dispenses, or would fain dispense, just what he pleases, and King and Queen must, or at least ought to, bow their heads in thankful acceptance of it. Such is Rome's decree, Mr. Laurier, whatever assertions in reference to such things irresponsible politicians may be pleased to make.

A professed "Liberal" leader, we would here further observe, who is of Catholic creed and association, and who patronizes and supports Jesuitism, is, I apprehend, all the more dangerous to Protestant interests because of his assumption of the term "liberal." He would be liberal to the illiberals, and to the most dangerous and liberty-destroying order of them associated with his church. But, never mind, the Pope throws his mantling wing over them, and they belong to his "church," and that of course is enough to justify the Jesuit-patronizing act of "liberal" Romanists. And no wonder, indeed, when even "liberal" Protestants do the same! But although undoubtedly a clever man, he is not the man whom a wise Protestant people would choose as the leader of the country's "Liberals." Liberal to Protestantism, as a Roman Catholic, he cannot be. He is therefore, I repeat, altogether unsuitable as the leader and representative of *Protestant* as well as "Catholic" interests; for such denominational interests cannot and will not be by him and his fellow Catholics ignored. He has patronized the Jesuits, (nor would he be a consistent Roman Catholic if he did not,) and he is hence unfit to represent Protestant interests in a Protestant country. It is, moreover, contrary to Popish inculcation and the inborn principles of any Roman Catholic to be a true *Liberal*. The Vatican permits them to be liberal just so far as they can enlist Protestant Liberalism and Protestant votes on the side of their church; and that is about the sum and substance of their Liberalism. To be generally acceptable to Protestants, therefore, and as a preparatory to the rendering of the very best services to both God and man of which you are capable, I would counsel you, Mr. Laurier, in the interests of your higher nature and better part, to forsake the old water-logged ship of the great "adversary" in which you have so long sailed; because she is carrying you, with multitudes of others, to the depths of a "Lake" which, it will be found, has something more to be dreaded in it than water! And this, observe, is not the mere flourish of a friendly pen; but, the Word of God being true, it will, beyond the shadow of a doubt, as to those who are under the blinding spell of Papal delusion, be found to be actual fact. Although pronounced unseaworthy for the past 1,500 years and all the time ruthlessly destroying with a popish high fever and spiritual epidemic her successive crews, she has, nevertheless, by the most prodigious efforts of vatican slaves, priestly pressgangs, and inquisitors, been kept afloat to the present time; but her ultimate doom is only a question of time, my friend, only a question of time. And if you were but endowed with as large a share of that "wisdom which is from above" as you are of natural gifts, you would forthwith hasten to obey the Divine command, "Come out of her, my people."

"Allow me to say also, that notwithstanding the fact that all your benighted clergy are required to subscribe and swear to the creed of Pope Pious IV., which declares that "this is the true Christian faith, out of which no one can be saved;" notwithstanding also the threat-



CORRECTION.—Tenth line from bottom should read :—And as to the future destiny—not *Purgatorial*, but eternal--of the one case out of the thousand, etc.



ening aspect of the fierce "bull" *Unan Sanctum* of Pope Boniface VIII., a part of which thus reads: "We declare, define, and pronounce that it is *absolutely essential* to the *salvation of every human being*, that he be subject unto the Roman Pontiff" which act still remains on your statute book; and notwithstanding the thunder and lightening imprecations annually denounced against Protestants by your savage "bull," *In Cena Domini*—I have ventured in this little pamphlet, not only to criticise your personal eligibility, or fitness, as a Roman Catholic, for the Premiership of Canada, but also to question the right of your persecuting, apostate church to even an existence within the Dominion or any any other Protestant territory. Your popish "bulls" may have dangerous horns; but you see I am not much afraid of them—a significant name, by the way, symbolical of the Scriptural "beast with horns"; because that through those official issuings, like mad or wild "bulls," as they are, they were wont, "aforetime to push," and tear and slay God's people, the righteous!—the "beast from the bottomless pit, having horns," and taking the form of a symbolical "bull" sitting in the Pope's chair, and exhibiting all the most ferocious qualities of the beast, as the "bull" issues therefrom and is let loose by the Popedom among a people who, by the measure of the distance between heaven and hell, God's service and the devil's, are more righteous than they.

You see then from the foregoing, Mr. Laurier, permit me to here further observe, although in continued divergence from the political bearing of our subject, that my opinion relative to the *future* prospects of Roman Catholics is very different from that expressed by those popes, as well as by your authoritative Council of Trent, where, to frighten their dupes to their idolatrous communion, they, in like manner, tell them, that "out of the [Roman] Catholic church is no salvation." *Sess. VII., Concerning Baptism, can. III., p. 44 ed. Leps.; 53, B.* Altho' long dead and buried, venerable Council, I would like, while still in the audience of your distinguished representative, Mr. Laurier, to have also something to say about this matter. And I demand of you this privilege all the more confidently, because, in my judgment, one Christian Protestant is as wise and a little wiser than any number, of Roman Catholics in "Christian" council assembled. Well, what I have to say is this: *Out of Christ* there is no salvation; but to be *in* your "church" is to the great mass of worshippers, to be *out of Christ*. What is the legitimate inference from this, or rather its necessary sequence? The most of you, I presume, are logicians enough to know. Nine hundred and ninety nine out of a thousand of your adherents, will never get as much as a smell of purgatory's fires, although prepared and lighted by the Pope for their especial benefit—will not, when on their way to their "father's" domains, be permitted to touch on its shores or even get a sight of them. And as to the one case out of the thousand, well, the very best that can be charitably said for it is—*uncertain*. One in a thousand, rising above the spiritless forms and cumbersome ceremonials of the Roman Catholic church, may possibly proceed, through grace, in getting their eyes and hearts savingly fixed on Christ and things truly spiritual; but the risk is terribly great. And even these very exceptional cases, if such there be, must necessarily find it up-hill work to the very end, shackled as they are with the very great and numerous doctrinal errors of the Papacy. And if saved at all, it must still be through the mercy of God leading them,



(they being truly sincere and earnest) in spite of the trammels of their "church," to rest for salvation on the atoning, justifying doctrines of the Cross. Renouncing all extrinsic merit, in utter self abnegation and true penitence, they would still have to come applying for salvation in accordance with the only true, Scriptural doctrine of justification, as expressed by the poet—

"In my hands no price I bring,  
Simply to Thy Cross I cling."

God's command is, "Come out of her my people." Those who obey the command, are, so far, all right; but those who do not, are all wrong. I may add, I should be very sorry to *needlessly* hurt the feelings of any one. I simply state what I am convinced are solemn facts, solely for the world and the truth's sake. "He that hath an ear to hear," for his soul's sake "let him hear." I am fully persuaded that no man in our day can be associated with the Roman Catholic church, except he be in a state of great spiritual darkness. Such, then, in the interests of this country and the Christian and Protestant religion, is my reply to your speech of the 30th ult., Mr. Laurier. I trust it may meet with your approval; or at least that you will appreciate and approve the motive that has dictated it.

Now I rather like, I may say the term "Liberal," and I certainly like the idea of "reform" as applied to individual life and conduct, and none the less as a rectifier of parliamentary and political corruption; and so I have taken the time and exercised the patience to read all the way through to the end the speech of another professed "reformer," which from its length must have taken a considerable time in delivery, the design of which was to prove that, being a *Reformer*, he could not have "consistently" voted, except in favor of an *Anti-reform* society! and that he could not have done justice to his "reform" constituency if he had voted unfavorably to the Jesuits—an anti-reform society of the very worst and most objectionable character, morally, religiously and politically, (for it deals largely in each article,) that the sun ever shone upon!—a society that originated in an anti-reform movement, and has been continued in existence ever since solely for anti-reform purposes! O, Consistency! truly thou art a jewel; but surely thou wilt not own that this heap of inconsistency, this M. P. for North Wellington, ticketed "*reform*" is thy possessor! Because, forsooth, "Liberals," in the government of the country as *Provincials*, have put on the airs of *independence* in relation to Dominion supervision and control, they must also grant to the Romish "*Il liberals*," the Jesuits, the liberty to erect an anti-British and an anti-Protestant fortification on the heights of Abraham, that by and bye no one may pass that way but those who can pronounce the Popish *Shibboleth*, and who is prepared to swear an undivided civil and religious allegiance to the Pope! The subterfuge of a sham or mere partizan "consistency" is thus made to take the place and precedence of a Protestant and true, as well as a wise and politic consistency. Consistent *reform* admits of *change*; so that, whatever past political views and policy may have been, a change for the better at the urgent demand of altered circumstances, is always admissible, and always consistent with reform principles. And it thus allows men, under any and all circumstances, to be *true to the right*.

The "reformer" to whom we have been referring was by name and honorary title, M. P. McMullen, and his explanatory deliverance upon

the occasion referred to was for the edification of an audience at Harrison. We hear and read of "nominal" Christians, i. e., Christians only in name, (such are Roman Catholics, and some Protestants,) but we have discovered also, and particularly in connection with this movement, that there are also nominal "reformers"—that is, "reformers," who being so labeled, have nothing but the label to show for it. He had also, he said, consulted Mr. Blake and Mr. McKenzie on the subject, and found them of the same mind as himself! Thus do this trio servilely bow the knee to the tripple crowned monarch of the Papacy! If by Imperial law the Jesuits have no British statutory right of existence, they can have no constitutional right of incorporation. This is as clear as it is demonstrable; and every Protestant lawyer or other gentleman in the corrupt combination, ought therefore to be utterly ashamed of such special pleading and moral principle as would lead him to contend for the honesty, the legality, and justness of his vote in support of the incorporation and endowment of the Jesuit institution.

Do not be deceived therefore, fellow-countrymen, by the stump speeches of such men; do not be hoodwinked by these Jesuitical subtleties in the form of "explanations." Black is black, and white is white; and tell them so, and that you are both old enough and intelligent enough to know it. Let no man, who is not in sympathy with the Jesuits, vote for any M. P., who will not pledge himself, so far as his vote and influence may go, to repeal all laws that have been enacted in their favor. Of course there will always be some men who go in for offices of some sort, however petty, who will, for that reason, vote for party Grit or party Conservative, as the case may be; but it will not be so with such as are of an honorable, upright, independent principle. And some there will also doubtless be, who will not scruple to otherwise work for party money; but do not you, as honorable, independent electors be found among them—neither thus sacrifice principle yourselves, nor be deceived or trapped by those who do. Others there are who, born Grit, Christened Grit, nursed and schooled Grit, or Conservative, as the case may be, like the victim of intemperance, cannot be persuaded, however hurtful it may be to him, to give up a long established habit; but in this case, gentlemen, let your manhood and intelligence rule Grit or Tory, and do not let Grit or Tory rule your intelligence and manhood. We have arrived at an age of the world when, favored with modern light and knowledge, it is surely time for us all, high and low, rich and poor, to act like men, and like men not only of intelligence, but of principle. We have the records of all history before us, and if we do not profit by the record, and if the experiences of the past do not tend to make better men of us, men of sterner moral principle, the progressive moral world, so far as we are concerned, has progressed in vain.

In conclusion I may say that whatever else a British elector, or a British M. P., forgets, whether in the parent State or in the Colonies, among other equally notable and atrocious crimes committed against Protestants, he will do well to *ever remember the fifth of November*, and the Jesuit, anti Protestant connection therewith; pledge himself, in view of its principles and aims, to an undying enmity to the "Order," and, upon the principles of self-protection and good will to the race, never rest at ease till Jesuitism and its parent, Romanism, are no more.

FAVORABLE NOTICES OF "REPLY TO PAINE'S AGE OF REASON."

FROM THE REV. J. WILD, D. D., *Pastor of Bond St. Congregational Church, Toronto* : "I have just finished reading your book, 'Original Reply to Paine's Age of Reason.' Thanks for the same. Your Reply is indeed original in argument and style. I wish you much success, and hope many will have the pleasure and profit of reading the book."

FROM THE REV. DR. F. GUNNER, *Congregational Minister, Listowel* : "Mr. Paine's book is a cunning device designed to mislead the uninformed mind, and to destroy if possible the Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures. This new and manly Reply of Mr. Stephens is a worthy and successful *rebutter*, and will prove itself to be an effective antidote to the mischievous devices and evil workings of Thomas Paine Ingersoll & Co. The pen of Mr. Stephens is well poised, and he is evidently 'set for the defence' of the truth of the Scriptures; and as long as men and women exist to practice and publish the errors of infidelity, and the the envenomed utterances of Thomas Paine, so long will the right many *expose* of such writers be required. The purchasers of this new and useful book will find that it is well worth the reading, and that it will also confirm the honest enquirer in the revealed religion of the Holy Scriptures."

FROM THE REV. DAVID DACK, *Pastor of Listowel Baptist Church* : "Having examined the work entitled 'An Original Reply to Paine's Age of Reason,' I do not hesitate to say that the author has fairly refuted his objections to Christianity, and this too in a style that will be especially attractive to the general public among whom such opinions as Paine's are likely to do most harm."

FROM HON. O. MOWAT, *Premier of Ontario* : Expressing "best wishes" for the success of the work, the Attorney General, although pressed for time, writes : "I have read with interest a considerable part of your Reply to Paine. Your book is characterised by earnestness and vigorous thought, and I have no doubt that it will render good service amongst those whom Paine's book would lead astray."

FROM THE REV. DR. COCHRANE, *Ex-Moderator of the Presbyterian Assembly, Ontario* : "I am of the opinion that no great harm can come from the circulation of Tom Paine's writings, when there are found those who are so ready and able to refute his arguments. Mr. Stephens in his reply to Paine shows a patience of detail and cogency of reasoning which will render the work invaluable to many."

FROM THE REV. ISAAC CAMPBELL, *Minister of Knox Church, Listowel* : "I have read with pleasure and profit a reply by Mr. E. Stephens to Paine's 'Age of Reason.' The book is well written. The arguments adduced by the author are fair, logical, and conclusive. No candid, intelligent reader can go through the book without feeling that the author has been eminently successful in exposing the errors of infidelity. I trust the book may have a wide circulation."

FROM THE REV. W. CAVAN, D. D., *President of Knox College, Toronto* : "I am pleased to learn that you are continuing your labors in defence of the Christian Faith and of Revelation. In an age when so many impugn Christianity it is well that it should have many defenders. You certainly write with good knowledge of your subject and in an effective way. The manner in which you present your arguments will make them highly useful, I cannot doubt, to a numerous class of readers. May He whose truth you thus defend be pleased to bless your efforts very abundantly."



## LOYALTY OF THE JESUITS TO THE BRITISH CROWN ;

— ALSO —

### MR. MERCIER'S AVOWED POLITICAL PRINCIPLES.

"You may tell the public," said the Jesuit Superior Turgeon to Premier Mercier, "that we are loyal to the Crown of England, as our history proves." "You are no child," said Premier Mercier to Lawyer Leboeuf ; "you know that in politics there are no principles." *Weekly Mail*, Dec. 12th, 1889.

And now gentlemen Mercier and Superior, having favored us with the above, hoping that it may not be too late for my printer, I am about, for your mutual edification to try my hand on rather my head, at verse making. But having never either written or attempted to write more than would fill two of these pages in my life, I must therefore beg your critical and considerate indulgence, as I set before you a reply in verse to your united deliverances, upon the occasion of receipting the \$400,000 taken from the Provincial Education Fund and appropriated to your use:—

"Loyal are the *Jesuits* to the Crown of Great Britain,"  
So said their Superior, a would be favorite of Heaven !  
But is not this assertion an equivocation,  
Jesuitically framed to practice deception  
Upon Protestants, who know that their canon and creed  
Instruct them to thus deceive and mislead ?  
Are these "loyal" who would take Britain's Protestant Crown  
And tread it with all that is Protestant down  
With the mire of the street; and place in its stead  
A Pope-given crown upon our monarch's head ?  
Were they "loyal to the crown," when the vile, cunning Fox  
Was discovered with the match and dry tinder-box,  
About to fire the powder by which it was sought  
To enact the notorious gunpowder plot ?  
Were they "loyal to England" in the case of the Colonists  
Who as Protestant pioneers were butchered by Romanists,  
Flayed alive because they were "Protestant heretics,"  
And not fit to live with holy "Catholics" and Jesuits,  
To which the Bishop of Three Rivers, who is Catholic in creed,  
Refers as a glorious, providential, retributive deed ?  
They are "loyal" as was Rome when it took from John's head  
The Crown of the Kingdom because he had said,  
Being then in no dread of its fagot, or rope,  
He would not submit to be taxed by the Pope ?  
What says, moreover, their oath of induction ?  
It contains for the discerning a mint of instruction.  
Do the terms of such oath show their loyalty to Kings ?—  
With expressions of disloyalty every part of it rings.  
But read it for yourselves in their works without fail,  
Lest, if I quote it, they serve me as they have done the *Mail*,  
And sue me for another fifty thousand or so,  
To buy guns and equipments for this most "loyal" foe !  
But "Fanatics," *L'Electeur*, and *Entender*, Mercier's organs maintain,  
Are all who against their disloyalty exclaim !

But all thought of disloyalty they can afford to disclaim,  
While in unrighteous receipt of their monetary "claim."  
But let the money be spent they'll find ground for a rent,  
And of their sacred assurances of "loyalty" repent.  
They will put in a plea, and this we shall see,  
For more Jesuit money to help forward the See;  
Nor care whence it comes, from you or from me,  
From "Catholic" slave, or the Protestant free!  
But money they must have, and the dominant power,  
Divinely bequeathed them as a Jesuit dower,  
Or hard words, if not bullets, they will plentifully shower,  
Until bribed and appeased for another brief hour!  
And so it goes on, and so will it go on,  
If Protestants are thus to be imposed upon,  
Until all their money or their freedom be gone!  
And thus having nothing further earthly to lose,  
Between death and their creed they will allow us to choose!

Thus the "loyalty" of Jesuits have we truly depicted,  
And none may deny that it is unprecedented.  
Nor are they unworthy of their father the Pope,  
Who sentenced all Protestants to the stake or the rope;  
And decreed it a Popishly virtuous thing  
To convert or to slay all who differed from him!  
And such are the laws and the canons of sin,  
Which Pope would have all the world to drink in!  
And that it will not, and cannot, gives him bitter chagrin!  
It worries and pains him, no doubt, to the heart,  
And goes to his vitals like a warriors dart!  
He is grieving, lamenting the loss of his power,  
Providentially confined to his Vatican bower!  
And a sympathetic "church" no doubt bears him a part,  
As do Jesuits who have pledged him their cunning and art,  
Having sworn their allegiance to him as their head—  
To relax neither efforts nor wiles, as they said,  
Until his foes were all either shackled or dead!  
Such is their loyalty to Britain's fair Queen!  
And such as it is it ever has been,  
And will be till, driven from England and America too,  
And, wandering o'er the world, like a wandering Jew,  
They find no rest for the sole of their shoe,  
Nor any more work for good Jesuits to do,  
They succumb to their enemies neither impotent nor few,  
And go straight to the place to which they've doomed me and you!  
"Loyal" to kings the Jesuit never has been  
Loyalty to the Pope and to original sin,  
Is the only loyalty you can get out of him.  
They are loyal to the Pope, the devil, and sin,  
And will be till their "father" has got them shut in,  
Where, as his faithful allies, they will get their reward,  
As righteously assigned them by our Saviour and Lord;  
And where they will have bitter occasion to say,  
As they, with the rich man, vainly pray  
For a drop of cold water to cool their tongue—

Which in bitterest anguish is from them wrung—  
“Had I served my God as I have served the Pope,  
He would not have left me thus without hope!”

—o—

“*There are no principles in politics*,” Mr. Mercier avers!  
And so to our mind it also occurs,  
There are no principles in Jesuitism, but those of diabolism;  
And in Jesuit and Mercier we have a digest of Romanism.  
But who has no principles as a chosen politician,  
Has no principles in his religion;  
Or, who bids his religion outside to tarry,  
While he goes in with a political opponent to parry,  
*Has no religion* into his politics to carry,  
But there is principle in everything, good or bad,  
And that the first he disclaims is certainly sad,  
In one who has dared to speak in God’s name,  
And thus convicted himself of taking it in vain!  
“Do all to the glory of God,” we are told;  
But Mercier, the Jesuit politician, makes bold  
To ignore the injunction, and against it show fight,  
Since his badge from the Pope will make it all right,  
And secure him admission to the regions of light!  
But to thus spurn and neglect the Saviour’s command,  
Will bar his admission to God’s right hand  
Unless a Pope’s dispensation be a Divine extenuation,  
And secure to the culprit a complete exculpation;  
And thus bring him to a place where a Pope has not been,  
On account of his blindness, apostasy, and sin.  
But in case this should fail him, Pope’s Purgatory will nail him,  
And give him a purging, or at least a good surging;  
Give his principles a shaking, set his conscience a quaking;  
And will at least make him feel, that he did not do well,  
When his soul for this world he consented to sell!  
Whether in politics or religion, the principle of righteousness,  
With its intimate counterpart, the principle of holiness,  
Are the only recognized principles of action  
Forming a scriptural basis for all human transaction.  
And so you will find it at the great court of inquiry,  
Messrs. Turgeon and Mercier—so note it in your diary;  
So that meeting together at the great coming Assize,  
You may not be taken altogether by surprise.  
For political words not charged with sincerity;  
For political deeds not charged with morality;  
An account you must give at the great day of judgment,  
And from it you will find there is no Popish escapement;  
Nor will a priest’s absolution be a legal release.  
You may call to remembrance your heads and your penance,  
Your frequent prayers for the Virgin’s interference,  
The priest’s holy water with which you’ve been sprinkled,  
Your instant attention to the bell when it tinkled  
A call of devotion to the “host” of the mass—  
By Heaven’s dread fiat they will all have to pass,  
Being as foreign to religion as the braying of an ass,  
As you will find at the judgment, alas! alas!



Such, Mercier, is my answer to your recent deliverance,  
 And so from the Jesuit I would counsel your severance ;  
 Seek a safer than Turgeon, who is spiritually unfit  
 To lead those who would avoid falling into the pit.  
 A "blind leader of the blind," his baseless assertion  
 About their "loyalty" might prompt to much critical diversion,  
 Lead all the discerning to a stampede desertion  
 From those who would lead them by tyrannous coercion,  
 Who know nothing themselves of Christian conversion.  
 As the devil from the beginning was nought but a liar,  
 So Pope, Bishop and Priest, or Dominican frier,  
 Being themselves cursed with blindness and darkness entire,  
 E'en though you might wish it can lead you no higher  
 Than the pit which contains the brimstone and fire !  
 "*Fanatics*," indeed ! If ever fanatic appeared on our earth,  
 If ever fanatic was by women given birth,  
 If ever fanatic has been justly so named ;  
 It is those who Rome's system of iniquity framed ;  
 It is those among whom its absurdities obtained ;  
 And those who exemption from error have claimed ;  
 It is those who their fellow immortals have chained ;  
 It is those from whom lightening anathemas have flamed ;  
 And who, being *devils*, would as *Gods* have reigned !  
 "*Fanatics*" are those who "believe a lie ;"  
 Who are unwilling their creed by the Scriptures to try ;  
 Who shut their eyes to God's truth whenever brought nigh ;  
 And who are justly in consequence, doomed to die !  
 The God of the Bible is faithful and true,  
 And what he has threatened He will certainly do,  
 But he is also gracious and merciful too ;  
 And if you truly repent and give your consent,  
 Saint merit a side, by His Word to abide,  
 Who will not His glory with another divide ;  
 Trust solely to the merits of the Crucified,  
 And to Christ alone for salvation apply—  
 You shall live, poor lost one, you shall not die !

But a word in conclusion about this "loyal" delusion—  
 "The Jesuits are loyal," you say, and to a *Protestant Crown* !  
 "'Tis a lie" might be echoed from every country and town !  
 They are disloyal to a man—disprove it if you can—  
 Why ousted from Brazil, France, China, Japan !  
 They were outlaw'd by England, Germany, Spain ;  
 But no sooner are they silenced than they are at it again,  
 Defiant of monarchs ! of the people the same !  
 Like "the prince of the air" they are found *everywhere*,  
 And with Leo at their back they seem not to care.  
 But as they have thus no constitutional existence,  
 Their incorporation is in manifest resistance  
 Of the laws of the realm and judicial consistence.  
 Say you, "The constitution is defective ?"—play the part of a detective ;  
 Ferret out the offender, demand an instant surrender.  
 Do not submit to a wrong because it's lived long ;

But go, point out to great Britain  
That it is unjustly, unwisely on its statute book written.  
She will then grant you a revise, if in her power it lies,  
And thus yield to the wish of the loyal and the wise.

---

### "THE NOBLE THIRTEEN."

The author of this pamphlet having noticed in the *Mail* a reference to some lines which have but just appeared in a Jesuit paper under the heading "The Devil's Thirteen," the following lines on the subject have been suggested just in time for insertion here :

"The Devil's Thirteen !"

So say the agents of "the father of lies."  
Who maliciously peer at them through Jesuit eyes ;  
But *deeds* not *words*, ye patrons of sin,  
Shall determine the character of the hated "Thirteen."  
Nobly planning and studying our Country's weal,  
And abhorrent of deeds which you cannot conceal,  
To prevent their enactment again, I wean.  
Was the laudable aim of the hated "Thirteen."  
Had they voted for Jesuits, conceding their claims,  
Ignoring their deeds, and their devilish aims,  
The evil-eyed Jesuit wouldn't have vented his spleen  
By pronouncing those patriots "the Devil's thirteen."  
Winking at Popery, its lies, and its crimes,  
Its canonical cruelties of all ages and times—  
Had they mantled your history and covered your sin,  
You would have wilily christened them "a noble 13."  
But glancing down through the ages, through the vista of time,  
They were justly indignant at your record of crime ;  
And ashamed with the traitorous '88 to be seen,  
They have won the distinction of "the Noble Thirteen"  
But those patrons of Jesuits, with the Pope at their head,  
Would sell our religion for a morsel of bread !  
But to save from such doom there thus comes between,  
Divinely inspired, "the noble Thirteen !"  
And "Equal Rights" gatherings, all over the land,  
Have caught the afflatus and taken the stand,  
That Sir John and his crew, be they Jesuit or Jew,  
Be they Grit or Conservative, many or few,  
Have no legal support on which they may lean,  
But that which was taken by "The Noble Thirteen."  
But "ferocious bigots" Rome is pleased to contend,  
Are all who have Protestant "Rights" to defend !  
So does *Cleary* his office and judgment bemean ;  
Which but adds to the lustre of of "The Noble Thirteen."  
"FEROCIOUS BIGOTS !" the Archbishop bellows,  
Because we would check Rome's blood-thirsty fellows,  
And dare to erect a barrier between  
The death of us all, with "The Noble Thirteen !"  
They would close our Bibles, and burn them withal,  
And send to the devil good Protestants all ;  
They would shut up our schools, and inquisitors screen  
Who would "rack" all that join "The Noble Thirteen."

And to think that M. P.'s in our Councils of Justice  
Should favor such Papists under mitre and surplice !  
It is clear such betrayers should no more be seen  
In our Legislative Halls with "The Noble Thirteen."  
To incorporate Orangemen were too righteous an Act  
For the '88 traitors to religiously enact ;  
But they'd incorporate the devil, it is plain to be seen,  
Were they not held in check by "The Noble Thirteen."  
But to incorporate Orangemen they are really not fit,  
Neither cringing Conservative, nor truckling Grit ;  
Nor should they accept it from a party between,  
Unless they can vote with "The Noble Thirteen."  
Four hundred thousand of an offering they've made  
To the people's worst foes, with the Pope at their head,  
Thus truckling for votes, thus traitorous and mean,  
Were all in the House but "The Noble Thirteen !"  
"Explanations" they will give, and paltry stuff,  
To suit idiots and thick skulls fully enough,  
And to sicken such men as the people convene  
To honor their heros, "The Noble Thirteen."  
But Grit and Conservative, representing this land,  
Have basely betrayed us into the enemy's hand !  
Then turn them all out, for they are not fit to be seen  
In our Parliament halls with "The Noble Thirteen."  
Let Jesuits, who have no legal existence,  
Push forward their claims with their wonted persistence,  
Unconstitutionally sustained as they also have been  
By those truckling opponents of "The Noble Thirteen"  
They never can make constitutionally right  
What is legally wrong in all honest men's sight ;  
Nor vote from wrong motives, as may clearly be seen,  
Without a hearty protest from "The Noble Thirteen."  
Then remodel your parties, create a commotion ;  
Elect a third party at the country's motion,  
On a platform of right that will not demean ;  
And thus crown with your laurels "The Noble Thirteen"—  
Men of honesty, principle, and Protestant consistency,  
Who would scorn to deceive or betray their constituency ;  
Men whose principles and aims do not centre in self,  
And the sole acquisition of power and pelf ;  
Men who, dreading the plague of a Popish regime,  
Will wisely assist them in a constant decline ;  
Will ever remember what to us they have been,  
Will keep an eye on them both subtle and keen,  
As, wisely and well, did "The Noble Thirteen."  
Whether Laurier, Sir John, McKenzie or Blake,  
I say, turn them all out, and give them a wake ;  
Give them all to understand they are not fit to be seen,  
Nor worthy to be numbered with "The Noble Thirteen."  
And having paid their 400' for a requiem song,  
Let them have its full value before very long ;  
Hand them over to the Jesuits to whom they careen,  
Never more to be seated with "The Noble Thirteen."



FAVORABLE NOTICES OF "REPLY TO PAINE'S AGE OF REASON."

FROM REV. J. COOPER ANTLIFFE, M. A., D. D., *Pastor Windsor St. Methodist Church, Montreal*: "Many thanks for the pamphlet you were good enough to send me a few week ago. I hope it may have a wide circulation, especially among those who are in danger of being misled by the sophistries of T. Paine; for I think a better and more popular antidote to the poison of Paine's writings cannot be found. It is written in a racy and conversational style, which makes its reading a pleasure; and the facts and arguments it contains are such that no infidel can successfully gainsay them."

FROM THE REV. W. S. PASCOE, D. D., *President London Methodist Conference, Ontario*: "Having read 'Original Reply to Paine's Age of Reason' quite through, the following testimonial of its merits I can honestly give. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the advocates of infidelity are very busy in their work of assailing the religion of the Bible; and as many of them get a good deal of their ammunition as well as their inspiration from Tom Paine, he who furnishes a good, readable, and popular reply to Paine does a good work. This the author has done. His book deserves a large circulation, for it is calculated to do much good."

FROM THE REV. ERASTUS I. BADGELY, M. A., L. L. D., *Professor of Logic and Philosophy, Victoria University Cobourg*: "I have examined your Reply to Paine's Age of Reason. It is readable, pithy, and pointed, and will do good among that large class of readers to whom a more philosophical and elaborate style of argument would be an unmeaning production."

FROM REV. W. I. SHAW, L. L. D., *Professor of Classics, Church History, etc., Wes. Theo. College, Montreal*: "Having examined Mr. Stephen's discussion of the form of Scepticism represented by Paine and Ingersoll, I have no hesitation in recommending it as a clear and conclusive refutation of the superficial and flippant type of infidelity with which it deals. The work, moreover, is written in a style so interesting as to make it most serviceable for popular use."

FROM THE REV. W. H. WITHROW, D. D., F. R. S. C., *Editor of the Canada Methodist Magazine, Toronto*: "I have examined with much interest your 'Reply to Thomas Paine,' and have much pleasure in commending it as a judicious and forcible refutation of the slanders against Christianity of that arch infidel. It cannot fail to establish in the faith any one who will carefully and candidly read it."

FROM THE REV. DR. N. BURWASH, *President of the Victoria University, Cobourg*: "I am sorry for the long delay, but the pressure of my work has, until now, made it impossible for me to so read your work as to give an honest opinion of it. 1. The style of the work is thoroughly popular. There runs through it a play of dashing wit, which, while it is keen as a razor, never stoops to vulgar abuse. 2. The work is founded on a careful and intelligent consideration of the great question discussed, and condenses the results of a large amount of reading, putting its material in an original form as well as adding many new ideas. It will help many to whom more elaborate volumes of philosophy would be of no benefit. Wishing you God's blessing on your book, I am," etc.

FAVORABLE NOTICES OF "ORIGINAL REPLY TO PAINE'S AGE OF REASON."

FROM THE REV. D. H. MACVICAR, D. D., L. L. D., *Principal and Professor of Theology, Presbyterian College, Montreal*: "Mr. E. Stephens, in his Reply to Paine and Ingersoll, \* handles their misrepresentations, ribaldry, and shallow sophisms with skill and success. I unhesitatingly commend the work as a popular contribution to the department of Christian Apologetics, the extensive circulation of which is fitted to be eminently useful."

FROM REV. W. ORMISTON, D. D., L. L. D., *Presbyterian Minister, New York*: "I have examined the pamphlet entitled 'A Reply to Paine's Age of Reason.' BY MR. E. STEPHENS. The work is a most excellent one of its kind, and furnishes evidence of careful reading, earnest thought, and deep convictions on the part of the writer. It well supplements and enforces what has already been written on that subject. I commend the work most heartily, and I feel assured that no one can read it without interest and profit. The style is clear and simple, the reasoning cogent and convincing, and the spirit fair and candid."

FROM THE HON. DANIEL WILSON, L. L. D., *President of the Toronto University*. The Honorable and learned Doctor, not being able "at present to spare the requisite time for a careful, critical perusal of the work," says: "I can add nothing to the weight of testimony of such men as the excellent Bishop of Huron, the Rev. Dr. Ormiston, and others whose favorable notices are appended to your work; but I most heartily wish you every success in your contention with Paine and Ingersoll, whose irreverent and profane assaults on the Scriptures and the Christian Faith are as offensive as they are mischievous."

FROM THE HON. JOHN MACDONALD, *Senator of the Dominion Government, Toronto*: "The work of Mr. E. Stephens in Reply to T. Paine on the sacred subject of a Divine Revelation, which Paine, in his ignorance, has foolishly attempted to turn into ridicule, exposes and refutes his falacies in a manner which will be found to not only instruct but profit."

FROM THE REV. E. A. STAFFORD, M. A., L. L. B., *Pastor Metropolitan Methodist Church, Toronto*: This gentleman "not having had time to read the work as carefully" he says "as he would desire to do it anything like justice," nevertheless speaks of it as "presenting the points with which it deals in an effective manner," and wishes it "an extensive sale and great influence for good."

FROM THE REV. B. F. AUSTIN, M. A., B. D., *Principal of Alma College, St. Thomas*: "I have examined with pleasure and profit the work by Mr. E. Stephens entitled 'A New and Original Reply to Paine's Age of Reason.' It is written in a clear and forcible style, and its arguments are original and convincing. It should have a wide sale."

FROM THE REV. GEO. RICHARDSON, *Ex-President of the Guelph Methodist Conference*: "I have read the Reply to Paine's Age of Reason by Mr. E. Stephens. The book is well written and its author evinces a thorough knowledge of the man whose writings he so ably refutes. He clearly demonstrates the fact that 'Tom' was either ignorant of the Scriptures and of the principles of Christianity, or wicked enough to publish what he knew to be untrue. At times the author may appear to be severe, but in this he is, I think, justified by the profane coarseness and blasphemies of the man with whom he had to deal. I believe the work will do good, and have pleasure in recommending it to the general public."

\* Our "Reply to Ingersoll" which has been examined in M. S. and recommended by Dr. MacVicar and other distinguished persons, has not yet been published.